

REMARKS

Summary Substance of Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courteous and productive Personal interview conducted on January 10, 2008. During the interview, Applicant's representative explained the definition of auxiliary machinery as recited in the claims and supported in the specification.

Also discussed was the Examiner's interpretation of the references with regard to the disclosure of a flat cable that is "provided on and extends along an outer surface of said auxiliary machinery." Even after the term "auxiliary machinery" was clarified, the Examiner maintained the position that the auxiliary machinery may be combined with some unspecified additional element resulting in a disclosure similar to the cited references.

Finally, the phrase "an exposed connecting portion" was discussed. The Examiner maintain the view that even though the connection of Fuchs is formed within a pocket in the connector, the connecting portion was "exposed to the outer surface."

No agreement with respect to the claims was reached.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19 and 20 --- 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,062,807 to Guss in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,652,293 to Fuchs and U.S. Pat. No. 5,443,403 to Weidler. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 3, and submits that the amended claims would not have been rendered obvious in view of the cited references, either alone or in combination.

The combination of Guss, Fuchs and Weidler does not disclose or suggest at least a connecting portion disposed on an outer surface of said housing which connects said discrete

connection terminal and at least one conductor of said flat cable, as recited in amended claim 1.

The Examiner concedes that Guss does not disclose an exposed connecting portion and relies on Fuchs for such disclosure. The Examiner alleges that although the connecting portion of Fuchs is formed within a pocket interior to the connector housing, an opening in the pocket exposes the connection.

As recited in the amended claim, however, the connecting portion is *disposed on an outer surface* of said housing. Therefore, even if the internal connecting portion disclosed by Fuchs can be construed as being exposed to the outside of the connector as alleged by the Examiner, Fuchs does not disclose or suggest a connecting portion disposed on an outer surface of the housing, as recited in the amended claim.

Further, neither Fuchs nor Guss, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest at least that a first portion of said flat cable which extends from said connecting portion is provided on and extends along an outer surface of said auxiliary machinery. Both references disclose a right-angle connector used to connect a cable to a separate piece of equipment, for example, an auxiliary machinery. Even if the disclosed right-angle connectors allow a cable to extend along an outer portion of the separate equipment, the connecting portion from which the cable extends in each case is not part of the separate equipment and is not disposed on the housing of the separate equipment, but instead is part of the right-angle connector.

Therefore, since the right-angle connector is separate from the equipment to which it connects, neither Fuchs nor Guss, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest at least a connecting portion disposed on an outer surface the housing, and that a first portion of said flat cable which extends from said connecting portion is provided on and extends along an outer surface of said auxiliary machinery, as recited in the claim.

Weidler does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of the Fuchs-Guss combination. The Examiner relies on Weidler to allegedly disclose conductors in a flat configuration. However, Weidler does not provide the disclosure missing in the combination of Fuchs and Guss.

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would not have been motivated to combine the references as attempted by the Examiner since the references, alone or in combination, would not disclose or suggest all the claimed elements.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Fuchs, Guss and Weidler. Claim 3 contains features similar to the features recited in claim 1 and is therefore patentable for similar reasons. Claims 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19 and 20 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependence.

Claim 2 — 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 2 has been rejected under § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Guss in view of Fuchs and Weidler, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,620,333 to Boyle. Applicant traverses this rejection.

The combination of Guss, Fuchs, Weidler and Boyle does not disclose or suggest at least a connecting portion disposed on an outer surface the housing, and a first portion of said flat cable which extends from said connecting portion is provided on and extends along an outer surface of said auxiliary machinery, as incorporated into claim 2 by virtue of its dependence from claim 1. As established above, the Guss-Fuchs-Weidler combination does not disclose or suggest these features. Boyle does not cure the deficiencies of the combined references.

The Examiner relies on Boyle to allegedly disclose a cable installed so as to extend along the outside of the housing. Boyle, however, merely discloses an electrical connector 14 with a

strain relief hood 18 (see Fig. 1). Boyle does not disclose or suggest the above-noted missing features.

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would not have been motivated to combine the references as attempted by the Examiner since the references, alone or in combination, would not disclose or suggest all the claimed elements.

Accordingly, claim 2 is patentable over the combination of Fuchs, Guss, Weidler and Boyle.

Claim 4 --- 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Guss in view of Fuchs and Weidler, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,238,426 to Arnett. Applicant has amended claim 4, and submits that the amended claim would not have been rendered obvious in view of the cited references, either alone or in combination.

Claim 4 recites features similar to the features recited in claims 1 and 3. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 is not rendered obvious over the Guss-Fuchs-Weidler combination for reasons similar to the reasons set forth above for claims 1 and 3. Arnett does not cure the deficiencies of the combination.

The Examiner relies on Arnett to allegedly disclose a mounting structure. However, Arnett does not disclose or suggest the above-noted features missing in the Guss-Fuchs-Weidler combination. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would not have been motivated to combine the references as attempted by the Examiner since the references, alone or in combination, would not disclose or suggest all the claimed elements.

Accordingly, claim 4 is patentable over the combination of Fuchs, Guss, Weidler and Arnett.

Claims 5, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18 and 21 --- 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Guss in view of Fuchs, Weidler and Arnett, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,125,852 to Archer. Applicant traverses this rejection.

The combination of Guss, Fuchs, Weidler, Arnett and Archer does not disclose or suggest at least a connecting portion disposed on an outer surface the housing, and a flat cable provided on and extending along an outer surface of said auxiliary machinery, as incorporated into the claims by virtue of their dependence from claim 4. As established above, the Guss-Fuchs-Weidler-Arnett combination does not disclose or suggest these features. Archer does not cure the deficiencies of the combined references.

The Examiner relies on Archer to allegedly disclose a retainer having a collar. Archer, however, does not disclosure or suggest the above-noted features missing in the Guss-Fuchs-Weidler-Arnett combination. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would not have been motivated to combine the references as attempted by the Examiner since the references, alone or in combination, would not disclose or suggest all the claimed elements.

Accordingly, claims 5, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18 and 21 are patentable over the combination of Guss, Fuchs, Weidler, Arnett and Archer.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Francis G. Plati, Sr.
Registration No. 59,153

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 3, 2008